

REMARKS

This amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action having a mailing date of May 8, 2006. Claim 1 is amended as shown. No new matter has been added. With this amendment, claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

I. Claim objections and rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

The Office Action objected to claim 8 by indicating that the drawings and specification do not clearly point out “a first circuit” and “a second circuit.” It is respectfully submitted that the specification and drawings do in fact clearly point out the “first circuit” and the “second circuit.”

For instance, it is respectfully reminded that the claims as filed form part of the specification. In this regard, dependent claim 9 describes that the “first circuit” includes “a first capacitor and inductor connected in parallel; a rectifier circuit having input terminals coupled to the parallel connection of the capacitor and inductor; a second capacitor coupled to output terminals of the rectifier circuit; and a voltage regulator coupled to the second capacitor and to the rectifier circuit.” Referring now to Figure 5 of the present application, the following elements are shown: a first capacitor C2 and inductor L2 connected in parallel, a rectifier circuit 13, a second capacitor Ca, and a voltage regulator 16.

Dependent claim 12 describes that for one embodiment, the “second circuit” includes “a decoder.” Figure 5 then shows a decoder 25. For another embodiment, dependent claim 13 describes the “second circuit” as including a “first filter” and a “first decoder.” Figure 6 then shows a filter 32 and a decoder 34.

Other portions of the specification (such as in the Detailed Description) contain additional disclosure of these specific elements that are consistent with the descriptions in claim 8 and its dependent claims pertaining to the “first circuit” and to the “second circuit.” Accordingly, it is clear that the drawings and specification clearly point out the “first circuit” and the “second circuit.” Therefore, it is kindly requested that the objection to claim 8 be withdrawn.

The Office Action further rejected claims 8 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, these claims

were alleged to contain subject matter that was not described in the specification. It is respectfully submitted that claims 8 and 10-11 do in fact meet enablement requirements.

For example and as previously explained above, the claims as filed form part of the specification and can thus be used themselves to provide enablement. Embodiments of the “first circuit” and the “second circuit” are described in claims 8-9 and 12-13, and further shown in Figures 5-6. The portion of the Detailed Description that corresponds to Figures 5-6 further provide additional disclosure pertaining to specific individual components that make up the “first circuit” and the “second circuit” recited in claims 8-9 and 12-13.

With regards to the “third circuit,” claim 12 describes one embodiment of the third circuit as including a “decoder.” Figure 5 then shows a decoder 26. Claim 13 describes another embodiment of the third circuit as including a “second filter” and a “second decoder.” Figure 6 then shows a filter 31 and a decoder 33. Other portions of the Detailed Description provide disclosure pertaining to these specific elements of the “third circuit.”

With regards to the “fourth circuit,” claim 8 recites that the fourth circuit is coupled to “process the demodulated second and third signals.” Figure 5 then shows a logic control circuit 17. Alternatively or additionally, a microprocessor 17 can be implemented as the fourth circuit to perform the recited processing.

With regards to the “fifth circuit,” claim 11 recites that the fifth circuit includes a modulator having an output coupled to a transistor. Figure 5 then shows a modulator 19 and a transistor T. The portions of the Detailed Description corresponding to Figure 5 provide additional disclosure regarding these specific components.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8 and 10-11 are enabled by the specification and drawings as filed. Accordingly, it is kindly requested that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

## II. Discussion of the claims in view of the cited reference

In the Office Action, claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Luc (U.S. Patent No. 6,473,028). In particular, the Office Action cited Figure 1 of Luc as disclosing the limitations contained in claims 1-20. For the reasons set forth below, it is

respectfully submitted that Luc does not disclose, teach, or suggest the limitations in claims 1-20. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

Figure 1 of Luc corresponds in general to prior art Figure 1 in the present application. Figure 1 of Luc discloses a transmission system between an electromagnetic transponder 10 and a terminal 1. The terminal 1 of Figure 1 of Luc is effectively capable of demodulating and decoding signals modulated by the sub-carrier of the transponder 10. *See, e.g.*, page 3, lines 8-15 in the BACKGROUND section of the present application.

It is noted that the terminal 1 of Luc is a reader (terminal) and not part of the transponder 10. That is, the terminal 1 and the transponder 10 of Luc are two different separate devices: a terminal and a transponder.

Independent claim 1 as filed recited, *inter alia*, “An electronic transponder ... comprising means capable of demodulating and decoding signals modulated by said sub-carrier.” Luc does not disclose, teach, or suggest such a feature. As explained above, Luc provides the terminal 1, rather than the transponder 10, with the capability to demodulate and decode signals that are modulated by the sub-carrier of his transponder 10. Luc does not provide his transponder 10 with the recited “means capable of demodulating and decoding signals modulated by said sub-carrier.” Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Luc.

Claim 1 is amended as shown to clarify that the recited demodulating and decoding means form part of a combination. Thus, amended claim 1 now meets the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, and is still allowable over Luc since nowhere does Luc disclose, teach, or suggest a transponder that comprises “means for demodulating signals modulated by said sub-carrier and means for decoding said signals.”

Dependent claim 2 recites, *inter alia*, “the transponder comprising a demodulator capable of differentiating information received at a rate of a back-modulation sub-carrier of another transponder with respect to information received, at a rate of a third still lower frequency, from the terminal.” Nowhere does Luc disclose, teach, or suggest such features pertaining to communication between two transponders. Instead, Luc only addresses

communication between a terminal 1 and a transponder 10, and not between the transponder 10 and some other transponder. Accordingly, claim 2 is allowable.

Independent claim 5 recites, *inter alia*, two transponders having “means for demodulating and decoding signals transmitted by another transponder in modulation of a sub-carrier at a second frequency.” As explained above, Luc only describes communication between the terminal 1 and the transponder 10, and does not disclose, teach, or suggest communication between two transponders, which have the means for demodulating and decoding as recited in claim 5. For instance, an embodiment within the scope of claim 5 is directed towards a direct communication between two transponders 10 present in the field of a terminal 1 from which they draw their power supply. *See, e.g.*, Figure 4 and page 8, lines 17 to 19 of the present application. Thus, claim 5 is allowable.

Independent claim 8 recites, *inter alia*, a transponder having a “third circuit ... to receive a third signal having a third frequency, the third signal being received from another transponder.” As explained above, the transponder 10 of Luc does not have any circuitry to receive signals from another transponder. Thus, claim 8 is allowable.

Claim 8 further recites that the third circuit is coupled in parallel to the second circuit of the transponder. Luc does not show such parallel-coupled circuits. Therefore, claim 8 is further allowable.

Dependent claims 12 and 13 recite elements of the second and third circuits of the transponder, specifically with the second and third circuits each having a decoder. Figure 1 of Luc only shows one (1) demodulator 18, and does not show two decoders as recited in claims 12 and 13. Thus, claims 12 and 13 are allowable.

Independent claim 16 recites, *inter alia*, a method for a transponder that includes “receiving a third signal having a third frequency from another transponder and distinguishing the received third signal from the second signal and demodulating the received third signal.” Luc does not meet these limitations. For example, Luc’s transponder 10 does not receive signals from or otherwise communicate with another transponder—his transponder 10 only communicates with the terminal 1. Moreover, Luc’s transponder 10 does not distinguish received transponder signals from other received signals—his transponder 10 cannot perform

such distinguishing since his transponder 10 is not configured to receive signals from other transponders. Thus, claim 16 is allowable.

Dependent claim 17 recites, *inter alia*, “using parallel decoders.” Luc does not provide parallel decoders in his transponder 10. Thus, claim 17 is allowable.

Independent claim 19 recites, *inter alia*, a system for a transponder including “a means for receiving a third signal having a third frequency from another transponder and distinguishing the received third signal from the second signal and demodulating the received third signal.” As explained above, Luc’s transponder 10 does not provide these features, since his terminal 1 (rather than his transponder 10) receives signals from another transponder. Claim 19 is therefore allowable.

Dependent claim 20 recites, *inter alia*, “means in parallel for decoding.” Luc does not provide means in parallel for decoding. Thus, claim 20 is allowable.

### III. Conclusion

Overall, none of the references singly or in any motivated combination disclose, teach, or suggest what is recited in the independent claims. Thus, given the above amendments and accompanying remarks, the independent claims are now in condition for allowance. The dependent claims that depend directly or indirectly on these independent claims are likewise allowable based on at least the same reasons and based on the recitations contained in each dependent claim.

If the undersigned attorney has overlooked a teaching in any of the cited references that is relevant to the allowability of the claims, the Examiner is requested to specifically point out where such teaching may be found. Further, if there are any informalities or questions that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (206) 622-4900.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090.

Application No. 10/712,325  
Reply to Office Action dated May 8, 2006

All of the claims remaining in the application are now clearly allowable.  
Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

/dmd/

---

Dennis M. de Guzman  
Registration No. 41,702

DMD:wt

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 6300  
Seattle, Washington 98104-7092  
Phone: (206) 622-4900  
Fax: (206) 682-6031

812806\_1.DOC